

correct" (see "Politically Correct" in The Canadian Forum (Sept, 1991) by T. McCormack for a PC argument in favour of the new curriculum). Meanwhile, the works of Shakespeare and Plato have to be "deconstructed" (have all the patriarchal or discriminatory basis of the works exposed and then eliminated) in order for "equality" to be possible. In addition, books such as Herman Melville's Moby-Dick must be completely removed from all curriculums because "There's not a woman in his book, the plot hinges on unkindness to animals, and the black characters mostly drown by chapter 29." As well, such fields as Psychology, Sociology, English, Law, Philosophy, and even Biology and Physics are part of this patriarchal hegemony, and must be countered by a new politically correct curriculum. This means not only the creation of new courses within these fields (a Psychology/Religious Studies course taught at UPEI will be looked at later), but also the creation of new politically correct fields. The most notable of these, even on this campus, is Women's Studies. This field is highly political in nature, anyone who has taken any Women's Studies courses on campus may have noted just a wee little bit of feminist doctrine. The concept behind Women's Studies is to have a field which serves the interests of women (as politics is meant to make gains for group interests of, and ultimately gain at least some amount of power to secure these interests), and the proponents of Women's Studies by no means deny this (i.e., see "The Uneasy Alliance of Feminism and Academia" by Marian Lowe and Margaret Lowe Benston in A Reader in Feminist Knowledge). For those who may feel this is not so, or a little paranoid, note that Lowe and Benston argue

Feminist and women's studies both came, of course, directly out of the women's movement. . . . Work styles within universities are based on the ideal of the competitive meritocracy, with its accompanying hierarchy and elitism. . . . the lack of women and minorities in most professions, act to reinforce the norms of the outside world. Scholars working within this framework are able to produce work that rationalizes and stabilizes social structures and protects various interests, including patriarchal ones, while still retaining the illusion that they are doing impeccably unbiased, objective work. . . . If, as part of our political programme, we are in the university at all, it is because we recognize the resources of academia for producing knowledge. We need to take full advantage of our opportunities to generate the knowledge we need (p. 48, 52, 57).

Thus concludes a look at some of the objections PC

has to our society and universities. Next will be a look at some of the objections that have been raised to PC.

The Politically Incorrect Objections

Here we will look at some of the theoretical arguments that have been used by opponents of PC (the editors obviously consider themselves opponents). Some of the more serious problems at PC will be looked at later. The traditional scholar that has spoken out against PC (most, not being used to the intermix of politics and academics have remained on the sidelines) will not deny, and acknowledge that white males have tended to hold positions of power in Western society. In addition, they will acknowledge that white male scholars have tended to study subjects of interest to them (although it remains to be seen--as opposed to ASSUMED--that the REASON for their interest was noted in their race sex, cultural origin or sexual orientation), and that research of interest to other groups may not have received the attention that other research has. The difference in opinion comes in regards to the political nature that proponents of PC have been advocating as a method of rectifying this. The proponents of PC have argued that truth is relative (if it exists) to the demographics (cultural makeup) of the individuals searching for truth; that is, academics is an exercise in power politics. Traditional scholars argue that there IS an absolute truth that can be found, and this truth that is out there will be the same for everyone NO MATTER WHAT THE COLOUR OF THEIR SKIN OR THEIR SEX! Even politics can be discussed in an objective manner, even this article can be presented in an objective manner--though it isn't, out of necessity to make a political statement. But we are not teaching university courses. The major point of the opponents of PC is the "politically correct" are trying to (and succeeding) in turning the university from an institution devoted to the search for truth to a battleground where "truth" is a cynical power-grab for one's own self-interests. In addition, to be able to construct such concepts as "false consciousness" based on accepting a situation not in one's "true interests," the proponents of PC have obviously discovered the meaning of life in order to determine what "true consciousness" and "true interests" are. Perhaps the politically correct should step back and realise that their politics is as much a matter of faith as any religion (the difference being that religious people are honest and admit religion is a matter of faith). Yet, according to the politically correct, our courses should be taught from this perspective. The truth may not always be "idealistic," but does that mean we hide under a politically correct rock? (How many students in any